

Ballistic properties of crystalline defects

V. Cvetkovic,^{1,*} Z. Nussinov,^{2,†} and J. Zaanen^{3,‡}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218*

²*Department of Physics, Washington University, MO 63160, USA*

³*Instituut Lorentz voor de theoretische natuurkunde, Universiteit Leiden,
P.O. Box 9506, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*

(Dated: May 19, 2009)

We introduce a field theoretic formalism enabling the direct study of dislocation and interstitial dynamics. Explicit expressions for the energies of such defects are given. We provide links to earlier numerical, discrete elastic, time dependent Ginzburg Landau, and other approaches sought by numerous authors for the problem of defect dynamics. The formalism introduced in this article may be extended to address many other systems. Apart from their heavily studied role in dislocation mediated crystal melting, defect dynamics recently gained much interest due to their viable role in various electronic and other systems of current interest. These systems include, yet are not limited to, stripe phases of Quantum Hall liquids, theories addressing the melting of stripe phases in various doped oxides (including the high temperature cuprate superconductors, the nickelates, and manganates), defects in supersolids, as well as colloidal crystals.

Introduction — The formulation of a field theoretical framework for analyzing *defect dynamics* in two dimensional crystals is the central goal of this work. Defects such as interstitials/vacancies, dislocations and disclinations [1, 2, 3] perturb the ideal perfectly periodic crystal. To date, numerous works extensively studied the dynamics of these defects, e.g., [4, 5, 6, 7, 8], and some further considered how these may, in turn, impede diffusion, e.g. [9]. Although much progress has been made in analyzing defect dynamics, a practical and general field theoretical approach that is free from the direct analysis of the equations of motion is lacking. Such a general framework will enable access to numerous physical systems of empirical interest. In the current publication, we report on precisely such an approach. For simplicity, we focus on dislocations and interstitials in two dimensional solids free from non-harmonic terms and dissipation. The extension to three dimensions is straightforward. The inclusion of disclinations is much more involved. In the two dimensional case, the defects are point-like. As these excitations are well localized, we can wonder if they exhibit the behavior of ballistic particles. For instance, *what is their energy when in motion?* The answer to this question is found in Eqs. (21, 22), our main result showing how both interstitials and dislocations run in a ‘sound barrier’ set by the phonon velocities in a way that is however different from a simple Lorentz invariance.

The accumulation of the defects whose dynamics we study here is commonly thought to melt the solid phase. Early on, Onsager [10] theorized that the λ transition in liquid ^4He is driven by an unbinding of vortex lines. Shockley [11] suggested that the melting of solids, in general, is driven by the proliferation of dislocations. These microscopic considerations were couched in a field theoretical formulation by Kleinert [3]. Empirical studies of these notions have been carried out, e.g., [12]. A scenario extending the two dimensional melting of [13] which fur-

ther suggested an intermediate phase driven by the proliferation of defects was advanced in [14, 15]. The glass transition has also been suggested to be related to defect dynamics [16, 17, 18]. In glasses, an extensive configurational entropy of these defects [16] (from which ensuing restrictive slow dynamics might follow [19]) may be sparked. Investigations of Frank Kasper phases [20] of defect lines and of related systems [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] have flourished. Recent years saw the extension of these ideas to various strongly correlated electronic systems in which the electronic constituents favored the formation of an ideal crystal like stripe pattern. Such patterns were detected in the high temperature superconductors and other oxides [28] and in quantum Hall systems [29]. Other systems harboring ideal stripe order include ferrofluids, diblock copolymers [30], and colloidal crystals [31, 32]. In an interesting development, recent experiments on solid Helium-4 [33] suggested supersolid-type features (a solid analogue of the superfluid phases) [34] and have led to a flurry of activity. Elastic defects [34, 35] may give rise to the observed phenomena either directly as superfluid or indirectly [36]. Indeed, experimental results show [37] that the measured putative supersolid-type feature is acutely sensitive to the quench rate. The results that we report here pertain to defect dynamics in these disparate arenas. Specifically, our results hold for all classical incarnations or bosonic variants in the quantum arena of these crystals. In earlier works we employed the general framework related to the one used here. This enabled us to study other facets of defect dynamics earlier and amongst other results, allowed to also find an elastic analogue of the Higgs effect [38, 39, 40, 41] and to derive the glide constraint of dislocations and to determine new non-linear corrections to it [41, 42].

Elastic gauge fields — Deformations in a two dimensional crystal are parameterized by a displacement field $\mathbf{u}$ monitoring the deviations of each constituent “atom”

relative to its location in the ideal crystal. We begin our analysis within Euclidean space (with $\tau = it$ the imaginary time) where the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu u^a C_{\mu\nu ab} \partial_\nu u^b + \dots \quad (1)$$

The Greek indices $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2$ with $\mu = 0$ (or $\nu = 0$) denoting a temporal component while $a, b = 1, 2$ correspond to spatial directions alone. To account for the dynamics of the constituent particles, a kinetic term borne by $C_{00ab} \equiv \rho \delta_{ab}$ is inserted ($C_{0iab} = 0$ for $i \neq 0$). The spatial components of the elasticity tensor C_{ijab} host the usual harmonic strain energies ($V^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_i u^a C_{ijab} \partial_j u^b$). With the kinetic ($C_{\tau\tau ab}$) term in tow, the variational equations immediately provide the classical dynamics. In the quantum arena, this kinetic term is introduced similarly for bosonic matter wherein the partition function

$$Z = \int D\mathbf{u} e^{-\int d^2x d\tau \mathcal{L}}, \quad (2)$$

We analyze the isotropic case, $C_{ijab} = \mu[\delta_{ij}\delta_{ab} + \delta_{ib}\delta_{ja} + \frac{2\nu}{1-\nu}\delta_{ia}\delta_{jb}]$ [43]. At short distances, terms containing higher derivatives become significant. For the studied isotropic case only two additional terms are symmetry allowed. The second order gradient energy density augmenting the first term of Eq.(1) is

$$V^{(2)} = 2\mu\ell^2(\nabla\omega)^2 + \frac{\mu}{1-\nu}\ell'^2(\nabla(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}))^2 \quad (3)$$

The length ℓ , relates to the local rotation ($\omega \equiv \frac{1}{2}\nabla \times \mathbf{u}$) inhomogeneities. At distances comparable to length ℓ' , the compression gradient becomes significant. As customary in studying defects elsewhere, we dualize the action. Stresses are dual to displacements and are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\mu^a &= i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_\mu u^a)} = i C_{\mu\nu ab} \partial_\nu u^b, \\ \tau_i' &= i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_i(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}))} = i \frac{2\mu}{1-\nu} \ell'^2 \partial_i(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}), \\ \tau_i &= i \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_i \omega)} = i 4\mu\ell^2 \partial_i \omega. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The temporal components σ_τ^a are the physical momenta, and the spatial σ_i^a are elastic stresses. The Hamiltonian density, $\mathcal{H} = i\sigma_\mu^a \partial_\mu^a + i\tau_i' \partial_i(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) + i\tau_i \partial_i \omega + \mathcal{L}$, becomes

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\mu^a (C_{\mu\nu ab})^{-1} \sigma_\mu^a + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\nu}{2\mu\ell'^2} \tau_i' \tau_i' + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{4\mu\ell^2} \tau_i \tau_i. \quad (5)$$

A (rotationally related) singularity present in this form is readily removed by enforcing the Ehrenfest constraint

$$\epsilon_{ab} \sigma_a^b = 0, \quad (6)$$

(with $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$). The dual action is recovered from the inverse Legendre transform $\mathcal{L}_{dual} = -i\sigma_\mu^a \partial_\mu^a - i\tau_i' \partial_i(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) - i\tau_i \partial_i \omega + \mathcal{H}$. The displacement has smooth and singular parts $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_{smooth} + \mathbf{u}_{singular}$ with $\mathbf{u}_{singular}$ carrying the defect contribution. Upon integration over $\mathbf{u}_{smooth}$, we are led to the constraint

$$0 = \partial_\mu [\sigma_\mu^a - \delta_{\mu a} \partial_i \tau_i' - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu a} \partial_i \tau_i]. \quad (7)$$

Eq.(7) is none other than an expression of a generalized (space-time) conservation law (in the simplest equilibrium setting, the spatial portion of Eq.(7) dictates a divergence-less stress σ which implies a net zero force acting on each volume element). Eq.(7) enables us to express the brackets as a curl of stress gauge fields,

$$\sigma_\mu^a = \epsilon_{\mu\lambda\rho} \partial_\lambda B_\rho^a + \delta_\mu^a \partial_i \tau_i' + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu a} \partial_i \tau_i. \quad (8)$$

From Eq.(8), it is evident that B is defined only up to a gauge transformation, ($B_\mu^a \rightarrow B_\mu^a + \partial_\mu f^a$ with arbitrary f^a leave σ_μ^a unchanged). In what follows, we compute in the Coulomb gauge $\partial_i B_i^a = 0$ where the calculations simplify considerably. After the partial integration, the singular components become minimally coupled to the dislocation currents to the gauge fields, leading to $[-iB_\mu^a J_\mu^a]$, wherein the dislocation currents

$$J_\mu^a = \epsilon_{\mu\rho\lambda} \partial_\mu \partial_\lambda u^a. \quad (9)$$

Following a Fourier transformation, we introduce a new basis. For fields of spatial momentum $\mathbf{q}$ (and frequency ω), we define two planar basis vectors- a longitudinal $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^L = \frac{\mathbf{q}}{|\mathbf{q}|} = (\cos \phi, \sin \phi)$ and a transversal $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}^T = \frac{\mathbf{q}^\perp}{|\mathbf{q}|} = (-\sin \phi, \cos \phi)$. Expressed in the new basis, the gauge fields are $B_\tau^a = i\tilde{e}_a^E B_\tau^E$ (double indices are summed over with $E = L, T$) and $B_i^a = -e_i^M \tilde{e}_a^E B_M^E$ (with $M = \tau, T$). In this basis, the Coulomb gauge fix condition becomes $B_L^E = 0$. Only the longitudinal components of the fields τ' and τ have a physical meaning. This allows us to omit the transversal components. Finally, the Ehrenfest constraint (Eq.(6)) may be employed to express $\tau = -B_\tau^L + i\frac{\omega}{q} B_T^T$, with $q \equiv \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}|^2 + \omega^2}$. Armed with the above constraints, an integration over the non-propagating fields, τ' and B_τ^E , leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_B = & \frac{1}{2} B_T^{L\dagger} \frac{\frac{\omega^2}{c_L^2} + q^2(1 + \ell'^2 q^2)}{\rho(1 + \ell'^2 q^2)} B_T^L + \frac{1}{2} B_T^{T\dagger} \frac{\frac{\omega^2}{c_T^2} + q^2(1 + \ell'^2 q^2)}{\rho(1 + \ell'^2 q^2)} B_T^T + \frac{1}{2} J_\tau^{T\dagger} \frac{2\mu}{q^2} \frac{1 + \nu + 2\ell'^2 q^2}{1 + \ell'^2 q^2} J_\tau^T \\ & + \frac{1}{2} J_\tau^{L\dagger} \frac{4\mu\ell^2}{1 + \ell'^2 q^2} J_\tau^L - i B_T^{L\dagger} \frac{(J_\tau^L - \nu J_\tau^T) + \ell'^2 q^2 (J_\tau^L - J_\tau^T)}{1 + \ell'^2 q^2} - i B_T^{T\dagger} \frac{(J_\tau^T - J_\tau^L) + \ell'^2 q^2 (J_\tau^L + J_\tau^T)}{1 + \ell'^2 q^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Eq.(10) constitutes a central result of our work. It enables a direct evaluation of energy densities from microscopic details. We will shortly illustrate how the energy densities for different defects (both static and dynamic) easily follow from this very general expression. Let us first comment on the various terms and associated symmetries. The first two terms in Eq.(10) contain propagators for the longitudinal and transversal “photon” (phonon) respectively. The third and fourth terms account for the interaction amongst static dislocation charges. Finally, the last two terms embody the coupling between the elastic photons and dynamical dislocation currents. As detailed elsewhere [42], the various current combinations adhere to different rotational symmetries- (i) the compression (or glide) current $[J_\tau^L - J_\tau^T]$ vanishes for dislocations; (ii) the current $J_\tau^E = \partial_\tau(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) - \nabla \times (\partial_\tau \mathbf{u})$ and (iii) the combination $[J_\tau^L + J_\tau^T \pm i J_\tau^T \mp i J_\tau^L]$ is a shear doublet. We now evaluate, by the insertion of the corresponding current densities (J) into Eq.(10), the energies of static and dynamic defects. We start with the static case. Associated with a static dislocation of Burgers vector $\mathbf{b}$ is a current $J_\tau^{a;disl.} = b^a \delta(\mathbf{r})$. Henceforth, we assume that $\mathbf{b} = b\mathbf{e}_x$. An interstitial can be viewed as a dislocation dipole – a difference of two dislocations carrying Burgers vectors of the size of lattice spacing (a), misplaced by a lattice spacing in the perpendicular direction. The current of an interstitial $J_\tau^{a;int.} = a^2 \epsilon_{ab} \partial_b \delta(\mathbf{r})$. In Fourier space,

$$\tilde{J}_\tau^{x;disl.}(q) = b, \quad \tilde{J}_\tau^{T;int.}(q) = qa^2. \quad (11)$$

When these external currents are inserted into the action of Eq.(10), we find the static energy of a single dislocation/interstitial. The range of integration over the momenta q in all pertinent integrals is $1/L < |q| < 1/\Delta$ with L the linear dimension of the system size and Δ the defect core size. We facilitate our calculation by setting $\Delta = a$. For a single static interstitial (where an infrared cut-off is not imperative), the energy derived from Eq.(10), the ‘action per unit time’, is

$$E_{static}^{int.} = 2\pi\mu a^2 \left[1 - \frac{1-\nu}{2} \frac{a^2}{\ell'^2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\ell'^2}{a^2}\right) \right]. \quad (12)$$

For static dislocations, the energy depends on higher order couplings and must be regularized by an IR cut-off,

$$E_{static}^{disl.} = \pi\mu b^2 \left[\ln\left(\frac{L^2}{a^2} \frac{1 + \frac{\ell'^2}{L^2}}{1 + \frac{\ell'^2}{L^2}}\right) + \frac{1-\nu}{2} \ln\left(\frac{a^2 + \ell'^2}{L^2 + \ell'^2}\right) \right] \quad (13)$$

The dislocation unbinding energy grows monotonically with the increase of the rotational gradient moduli ℓ (Eq.(3)) yet is bounded from above. By contrast, the disclination energy $E_{static}^{discl.}$ grows with the square of the same coupling. (The latter may be verified by a simple rotationally symmetric ansatz.) Thus, high values of the rotational stiffness ℓ suggest a new, intermediate phase- in accordance with the known results [14, 38].

We next employ Eq.(10) to determine the action of moving defects. For a uniformly moving defect, the delta function constraint of the temporal component of the current is boosted to $\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}\tau) = \delta(x - v\tau)\delta(y)$. For the interstitial motion in all directions is possible. By contrast, single dislocation can only “glide”, i.e. move parallel to their Burgers’ vectors [1, 2, 3, 38, 42]. As a consequence, in dealing with dislocations we must consider only velocities parallel to the Burgers vector. After Fourier transformation, the temporal currents for an interstitial and a dislocation are, respectively,

$$\tilde{J}_\tau^{T;int.}(q) = qa^2; \quad \tilde{J}_\tau^{x;disl.}(q) = b\delta(\omega - vq_x)\delta(\omega - vq_x).$$

The corresponding spatial components are

$$\tilde{J}_x^{T;int.} = ivqa^2\delta(\omega - vq_x), \quad \tilde{J}_x^{x;disl.} = vb\delta(\omega - vq_x).$$

The action per unit time of a kinetic interstitial exceeds that of a static interstitial by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{kin}^{int.} & \approx \frac{1}{2} v^2 \rho \pi a^2 \\ & \times \left[1 + \frac{(1+\nu)^2}{2(1 + \frac{\ell'^2}{a^2})} + (1+\nu) \frac{a^2}{\ell'^2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\ell'^2}{a^2}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The analogous ‘kinetic’ action density for a dislocation is

$$\begin{aligned} E_{kin}^{disl.} & \approx v^2 \rho b^2 \frac{\pi}{4} \\ & \times \left\{ \left[\frac{3}{1 + \frac{L^2}{\ell'^2}} - \frac{3}{1 + \frac{a^2}{\ell'^2}} + \ln \frac{L^2 + \ell'^2}{a^2 + \ell'^2} \right] + \right. \\ & \left. + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{2}\right)^2 \left[\frac{1}{1 + \frac{L^2}{\ell'^2}} - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{a^2}{\ell'^2}} + \ln \frac{L^2 + \ell'^2}{a^2 + \ell'^2} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

‘Covariant’ mapping of a defect gas — With the action densities for both static and dynamic defects at our disposal, we may now map our system onto a Ginsburg-Landau-Wilson action of the form employed to describe a gas of random loops

$$S_{GLW} = \int d\mathbf{x} d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2} |\partial_\mu \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} m^2 |\psi|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} |\psi|^4 \right]. \quad (16)$$

With imaginary time as an extra dimension, point defects become world lines and the action (16) is valid as a description of a defect gas. The mapping procedure leading to Eq.(16), employs a representation of the defect gas where, upon conversion with some (yet unknown) velocity c_d ($x_0 = c_d\tau$), the action of a defect is proportional to its world-line length. We will shortly relate c_d to the phonon velocity. A defect, moving with velocity v during a time $\Delta\tau$, contributes to the action an amount

$$\Delta S = \epsilon_0 \Delta\tau \sqrt{1 + \frac{v^2}{c_d^2}} \approx \Delta\tau [\epsilon_0 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_0 \frac{v^2}{c_d^2}], \quad (17)$$

with ϵ_0 the defect core energy. Contrasting this with Eqs.(13, 15), we find (for $\ell, \ell' \lesssim a \ll L$) that

$$(c_{d;disl.})^2 = \frac{\mu}{\rho} \frac{1 + \nu}{1 + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{2}\right)^2}. \quad (18)$$

Knowing the velocity (Eq.(18)), the action for the gas of dislocations has the derivative term precisely set by the first term of Eq.(16),

$$|\partial_\mu \psi|^2 = \frac{1}{2c_d^2} |\partial_\tau \psi|^2 + |\nabla \psi|^2. \quad (19)$$

The factor of two in the denominator appears for dislocation as a consequence of the glide principle- motion in a direction transverse to the burgers vector (climb) is not allowed for dislocations. Constrained defect motion

does not lead to an effective dimensionality reduction of the defect gas. Instead, a factor of two for velocity in Eq.(19) arises [38], yet the physical propagators exhibit poles corresponding to the physical velocity c_d .

Similar expressions may be derived within this framework for single interstitials. The differences are that the factor of two lacks from equivalent of Eq. (19) due to the fact that interstitials are not constrained by glide, and that the interstitial velocity takes form

$$(c_{d;int.})^2 = \frac{\mu}{\rho} \frac{2(1 + \nu)}{1 + (2 + \nu)^2}. \quad (20)$$

Real time ballistics — Upon extending our results to real time, we find that the energy diverges as the velocity approaches the velocity of ‘signal carriers’ – phonons, $v \rightarrow c_T$ (the transversal phonon velocity is smaller and it bounds the speed of a defect). As the energy has a more complicated form than in the imaginary time formulation, we expose only $\ell = \ell' = 0$ limit where we can give exact analytic expressions. With the previously defined defect currents, now in real time, two gauge fields (phonons) will have the solutions

$$B_T^L = \frac{\rho}{q^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c_L^2}} (J_T^L - \nu J_L^T), \quad B_T^T = \frac{\rho}{q^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c_T^2}} (J_T^T - J_L^L).$$

When these fields are inserted in Eq.(10) and an integration over Fourier space is performed, we obtain the total (including the static part) energy of defects

$$E^{int.} = \pi \mu a^2 \left[\frac{(1 + \nu)(4 - 3\nu)}{2(1 - \nu)} + \frac{\nu^2}{1 - \nu} \frac{1}{1 - \beta_L^2} - \frac{1}{1 - \beta_T^2} + \frac{1}{2(1 - \beta_T^2)^{3/2}} \right], \quad (21)$$

$$E^{disl.} = \pi \mu b^2 \ln \frac{L}{a} \left\{ \frac{\nu(2 - \nu)}{1 - \nu} + \frac{12\nu(2 - \nu)}{(1 - \nu)^2 \beta_T^2} + \frac{6 - 4\beta_L^2}{(1 - \nu)\beta_L^2 \sqrt{1 - \beta_L^2}} - \frac{7\beta_T^4 - 20\beta_T^2 + 12}{\beta_T^2(1 - \beta_T^2)^{3/2}} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Here, $\beta_{T,L} \equiv \frac{v}{c_{T,L}}$. As the Lagrangian of Eq.(1) is not “Lorentz invariant”, these expressions do not adhere to a single simple covariant form ($\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}$). Nevertheless, we find that divergences occur when $\beta \rightarrow 1$. This divergence of the energy was obtained in our derivation by employing the lowest order terms in the elastic gradient expansion for the Lagrangian density and need not constitute a fundamental limitation on interstitial and other defect motion. Two velocities appearing in the problem complicate the energy further – the low velocity approximation yields ballistics (c_d) which resemble properties from both sectors. On the other side, “causality” is driven exclusively by the transverse phonon velocity as the energy of a dislocation diverges already at that

velocity. For small defect velocities, the real time dynamics is not radically different from that in imaginary time. At high velocities, retardation effects (triggered by finite phonon velocities) come to the fore and the (real time) energy vividly displays the role of “causality” in the elastic medium. Eq.(22) illustrates the power of our formalism. With slight variations and different defect current densities, Eq.(10) allows the determination of numerous static and dynamic dislocation/interstitial configurations.

Conclusion — In this work, we illustrate that the old problem of defect dynamics which is quite cumbersome within the common strain formalism becomes far easier within the framework introduced here. Much unlike the strain formalism, where higher order couplings are

necessary to close a set of differential equations, in the formalism studied in the current article, we obtain expressions which are exact and fairly trivially. To illustrate the power of our formulation, we compute the energies of moving dislocations and interstitials (Eq.(22)). With slight variations and different realizations of defect current densities, Eq.(10) allows the analysis of numerous static and dynamic dislocation/interstitial configurations. As the problem of elastic defect dynamics has myriad manifestations – crystals, glasses, liquid crystals, several strongly correlated electronic systems, and many others – our study affords a fresh perspective on the defect dynamics within these systems.

We conclude with two brief remarks— (i) The dynamics found in imaginary time has a crucial consequence on various properties of a special nematic phase of a crystal wherein only dislocations proliferate [38]. Here, dynamic dislocations alter physical measurable quantities such as elastic response as well as electric response functions [40]. (ii) Within this work, only dislocation defect currents were treated. To accommodate disclination defects, we need to define the fields B of Eq.(8) such that $B_\mu^a = \partial_a A_\mu^L + \epsilon_{ab} \partial_b A_\mu^T$. The “double curl gauge fields” $A_\mu^{L,T}$ are defined up to innocuous shifts, $\delta A_\mu^{L,T} = \partial_\mu g^{L,T}$.

Acknowledgments — VC wishes to thank Daniel No-
gradi for useful discussions.

* Electronic address: vladimir@pha.jhu.edu

† Electronic address: zohar@wuphys.wustl.edu

‡ Electronic address: jan@lorentz.leidenuniv.nl

- [1] J. Friedel, *Dislocations*, Pergamon press, New York, 1954;
- [2] F. R. N. Nabarro, *Theory of Dislocations*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1967
- [3] H. Kleinert, *Gauge fields in Condensed Matter*, Vol. II: *Stresses and Defects, Differential Geometry, Crystal Defects* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989)
- [4] T. Hatano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 085501 (2004)
- [5] A. Carpio, L. L. Bonilla, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 135502 (2003)
- [6] M. Karttunen, M. Haataja, K. R. Elder, M. Grant, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3518 (1999)
- [7] I. S. Aranson, S. Scheidl, V. M. Vinokur, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 14541 (1998)
- [8] P. Shasrma and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. A **349**, 170 (2006)
- [9] Ligang Chen, M. W. Deem, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 021107 (2003)
- [10] L. Onsager, Nuovo Cim. Suppl. **6**, 249 (1949), Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **51**, 627 (1949)
- [11] W. Shockley, *L'Etat Solide*, Proceeding of Neuvieme-Consail de Physique, Brussels, 1952, Ed. R. Stoops, (Solvay Institut de Physique, Brussels)
- [12] L. Burakovsky and D. L. Preston, Solid State Comm., **115**, 341 (2000)
- [13] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. Thouless, J. Phys. C **5**, L124 (1972); *ibid*, **6**, 181 (1973)
- [14] D. R. Nelson and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **19**, 2457 (1979), A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B, **19**, 1855 (1979)
- [15] David R. Nelson, *Defects and Geometry in Condensed Matter Physics*, Cambridge University Press (2002)
- [16] Z. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 014208 (2004)
- [17] G. Tarjus, S. A. Kivelson, Z. Nussinov, P. Viot, J. Phys: Condens. Matter **17**, R1143 (2005)
- [18] F. Sausset and G. Tarjus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 155701 (2008)
- [19] T. R. Kirkpatrick and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 3072 (1987); Phys. Rev. B **36**, 8552 (1987); T. R. Kirkpatrick, D. Thirumalai and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1045 (1989); T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2091 (1987)
- [20] F. C. Frank and J. S. Kasper, Acta Crystallogr. **11**, 184 (1958), **12**, 483 (1959)
- [21] J. F. Sadoc and R. Mosseri, “*Geometrical Frustration*”, Cambridge University Press (1999), and references therein
- [22] D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. B **28**, 5515 (1983)
- [23] J. F. Sadoc, J. de Physique Lett., **44**, L-707 (1983)
- [24] J. P. Sethna, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 6278 (1985)
- [25] J. F. Sadoc and J. Charvolin, J. de Physique, **47**, 683 (1986)
- [26] S. Sachdev and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. B, **32**, 1480 (1985)
- [27] N. Rivier, Phil. Mag. B, **40**, 859 (1979); N. Rivier, *The Taniguchi Symposium on The Nature of Topological Disorder*, F. Yonezawa and T. Ninomiya, editors, Springer Verlag, 14 (1983)
- [28] J. M. Tranquada et al., Nature **375**, 51 (1995); S. More, C. H. Chen, and S.- W. Cheong, Nature **392**, 473 (1998)
- [29] M. P. Lilly et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 394 (1999)
- [30] M. Seul and D. Andelman, Science, **267**, 476 (1995)
- [31] B. V. Derjaguin and L. Landau, Acta Physiochim, URSS **14**, 633 (1941); E. J. Verwey and J. T. G. Overbeek *Theory of Stability of Lyophobic Colloids* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1948)
- [32] C. Reichhardt and C. J. Olson, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 248301 (2002)
- [33] E. Kim and M. H. Chan, Science **305**, 1941 (2004); E. Kim and M. H. W. Chan, Nature **427**, 225 (2004).
- [34] A. F. Andreev and I. M. Lifshitz, Sov. Phys. JETP **29**, 1107 (1969); G. V. Chester and L. Reatto, Phys. Rev. **155**, 88 (1967); L. Reatto, Phys. Rev. **183**, 334 (1969); A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 1543 (1970); P.W. Anderson, Basic Notions of Condensed Matter Physics (Benjamin, Menlo Park, CA, 1984). G.V. Chester, Phys. Rev. A **2**, 256 (1970).
- [35] S. Sasaki, R. Ishiguro, F. Caupin, H. J. Maris, S. Balibar, Science **313**, 1098 (2006); S. Sasaki, F. Caupin, and S. Balibar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 205302 (2007).
- [36] A. V. Balatsky, Z. Nussinov, M. J. Graf, and S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 094201 (2007); Z. Nussinov, A. V. Balatsky, M. J. Graf, and S. A. Trugman, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 014530 (2007); C-D. Yoo and A. Dorsey, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 100504(R) (2009)
- [37] A. S. C. Rittner and J. D. Reppy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 175302 (2007).
- [38] J. Zaanen, Z. Nussinov, S. I. Mukhin, Annals of Physics, **310/1**, 181 (2004)
- [39] V. Cvetkovic and J. Zaanen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 045701 (2006)
- [40] V. Cvetkovic, Z. Nussinov, S. Mukhin, and J. Zaanen, Europhys. Lett. **81**, 27001 (2008)
- [41] V. Cvetkovic. PhD thesis, University of Leiden (2006)

- [42] V. Cvetkovic, Z. Nussinov, and J. Zaanen, *Philos. Mag.* **86**, 2995 (2006) $\nu \leq 1$.
- [43] The Poisson ratio in 2D is $\nu = \frac{\kappa - \mu}{\kappa + \nu}$ taking values $-1 \leq$